

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,515,548 to Matsumoto et al. ("Matsumoto").

Claims 2, 10, 12, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0208286 to Abercrombie ("Abercrombie").

Claims 6-8 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0022081 to Syed ("Syed").

Claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in dependent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-20 remain pending.

#### Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With respect to independent claims 1 and 11, the Office Action states that Matsumoto discloses all of the recited elements.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to incorporate the salient features of respective dependent claims 9 and 19, namely the additional steps of: testing the chip to determine a realistic indication of speed at a predetermined maximum temperature; and sorting the chip into a speed category. As the Examiner has stated claims 9 and 19 would be allowable if written in independent form, therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are now allowable over Matsumoto. Further, no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1 and 11, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore allowable over Matsumoto for at least those reasons provided for independent claims 1 and 11.

Rejection of Claims 2, 10, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action States that Matsumoto teaches the subject matter of claims 1 and 11, but does not mention expressly, with respect to claims 2 and 12, sorting the chip into a category based upon the adjusted temperature sensitive parameter of the chip. Further, with respect to claims 10 and 20, Matsumoto does not mention testing the chip in production tests to classify each chip into different categories of the temperature sensitive parameter. The Office Action further states that Abercrombie discloses a method of manufacturing integrated circuits, and teaches sorting an integrated circuit chip into a category based upon a temperature sensitive manufacturing parameter of the chip, and testing the chip in production tests to classify each chip into different categories of the temperature sensitive parameter.

As previously stated, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to incorporate the salient features of respective dependent claims 9 and 19, namely the additional steps of: testing the chip to determine a realistic indication of speed at a predetermined maximum temperature; and sorting the chip into a speed category. As the Examiner has stated claims 9 and 19 would be allowable if written in independent form, therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are now allowable over Matsumoto and Abercrombie. Further, no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 2, 10, 12, and 20, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1 and 11, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore allowable over Matsumoto and Abercrombie for at least those reasons provided for claims 1 and 11.

Rejection of Claims 6-8 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action states that Matsumoto teaches the subject matter of claims 1 and 11, but does not but does not mention expressly, with respect to claims 6 and 16, determining a change of the temperature sensitive parameter of the chip that is the chip power consumption. Further, with respect to claims 7 and 17, Matsumoto does not mention determining a change of the temperature sensitive parameter of the chip that is the chip I/O timings. Further still, with respect to claim 8 and 18, Matsumoto does not mention determining maximum and minimum voltage test which measure the highest and lowest possible voltages at which a product will operate. The Office Action further states that Syed discloses test systems for testing integrated circuit devices and for calibrating associated system and methods, and teaches determining a change of the temperature sensitive parameter of the chip that is the chip power consumption, determining a change of the temperature sensitive parameter of the chip that is the chip I/O timings, and determining maximum and minimum voltage test which measure the highest and lowest possible voltages at which a product will operate.

As previously stated, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to incorporate the salient features of respective dependent claims 9 and 19, namely the additional steps of: testing the chip to determine a realistic indication of speed at a predetermined maximum temperature; and sorting the chip into a speed category. As the Examiner has stated claims 9 and 19 would be

allowable if written in independent form, therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are now allowable over Matsumoto and Syed. Further, no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 6-8 and 16-18, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1 and 11, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore allowable over Matsumoto and Syed for at least those reasons provided for independent claims 1 and 11.

Objection to claims 5, 9, 15, and 19

The Office Action states that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in dependent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to incorporate the salient features of respective dependent claims 9 and 19, namely the additional steps of: testing the chip to determine a realistic indication of speed at a predetermined maximum temperature; and sorting the chip into a speed category. As the Examiner has stated claims 9 and 19 would be allowable if written in independent form, therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are now allowable. Further, no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 5, 9, 15, and 19, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1 and 11, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore allowable for at least those reasons provided for independent claims 1 and 11.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman  
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

SF:BMM:ej